

## **REMARKS**

### **Interview Summary**

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during a personal interview held on November 16, 2005. The Examiner was favorably inclined toward the proposed new Claims 20-26 which are essentially identical to those filed herewith. The "fixed length" feature of Claim 20 and "substantially perpendicular" actuation feature of Claim 23 were discussed.

### **Responsive Arguments**

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-19 stand rejected. Claims 1-19 have been canceled and new Claims 20-26 have been added herein. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the present amendments and following remarks. The above amendments and following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and to render all claims at issue patentably distinct over the references cited.


The Examiner rejected Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, this rejection is deemed moot in light of the claim cancellations. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Bailly et al. (French Patent No. FR 2,773,890). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, this rejection is deemed moot in light of the claim cancellations. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the instant amendments, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that the Examiner pass the case to issue at her earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: DEC. 21, 2005

By:   
Monte L. Falcoff, Reg. No. 37,617

HARNES, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MLF/cmg